

## **REMARKS**

Pursuant to the prior restrictions, claims 1-3 and 11-29 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4-10 are pending in the present application. Claim 4 is amended.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections**

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 4, 5, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,417,896 to Yamazaki and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamazaki is respectfully requested.

Yamazaki does not disclose or suggest, *a transmissive electrode ... formed in [a] first region, a reflective electrode ... formed in [a] second region that is adjacent to the first region, and a ... same compensating wiring ... facing the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode*, as essentially recited in claim 4.

The Examiner suggests that adjacent pixel electrode 212 and pixel electrode 213 of FIG. 5c of Yamazaki respectively disclose the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode of claim 4.

However, unlike the reflective electrode and transmissive electrode of claim 4, which both face the same compensating wiring, the pixel electrode 212 and pixel electrode 213 of Yamazaki do not both face a same compensating wiring. For example, FIG. 5c of Yamazaki shows that pixel electrode 212 faces only capacitive line 206, but not also capacitive line 207. Further, FIG. 5c of Yamazaki shows that pixel electrode 213 faces only capacitive line 207, but not also capacitive line 206. Indeed Yamazaki states (in col. 9, lines 6-9) that "[t]he capacitive line 206 is not overlapped with the pixel

electrode 213 of a corresponding line, but is overlapped with the pixel electrode 212 which is one line higher.” Further, Yamazaki is silent on whether the pixel electrode 212 is a reflective electrode and is silent on whether the pixel electrode 213 is a transmissive electrode.

The Examiner also suggests that pixel electrode 905 of FIG. 10 may disclose the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode of claim 4.

However, unlike the reflective electrode and transmissive electrode of claim 4, which both face a same compensating wiring, the pixel electrode 905 does not include adjacent reflective and transmissive portions that both face a same compensating wiring. For example, FIG. 10 of Yamazaki teaches (in FIG. 10 and col. 9, lines 54-57) that capacitive line 903 does not face any portion of pixel electrode 905. Further, Yamazaki is silent regarding whether pixel electrode 905 includes adjacent transmissive and reflective portions.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Yamazaki fails to disclose or suggest, *a transmissive electrode ... formed in [a] first region, a reflective electrode ... formed in [a] second region that is adjacent to the first region, and a ... same compensating wiring ... facing the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode*, as essentially recited in claim 4. Thus, claim 4 is believed to be patentable over Yamazaki.

Claims 5, 8, and 9 are believed to be patentable over Yamazaki at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 4.

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,040,882 to Jun, in view of Yamazaki is respectfully requested.

Jun and Yamazaki, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *a transmissive electrode ... formed in [a] first region, a reflective electrode ... formed in [a] second region that is adjacent to the first region, and a ... same compensating wiring ... facing the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode*, as essentially recited in claim 4.

The Examiner suggests that pixel electrodes 40a and 40b of Jun respectively disclose the reflective and transmissive electrodes of claim 4.

However, unlike the reflective electrode of claim 4, none of pixel electrodes 40a and 40b of Jun is a reflective electrode. For example, Jun teaches (in col.4, lines 40-44) that each of the pixel electrodes 40a and 40b is formed of a transparent conductive material. Opposite to the reflective electrode of claim 4, which reflects light, pixel electrodes 40a and 40b of Jun, which are made out of a transparent material, absorb light.

Thus, Jun does not disclose *a transmissive electrode ... formed in [a] first region, a reflective electrode ... formed in [a] second region that is adjacent to the first region, and a ... same compensating wiring ... facing the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode*, as essentially recited in claim 4.

Further, as discussed above, Yamazaki does not disclose *a transmissive electrode ... formed in [a] first region, a reflective electrode ... formed in [a] second region that is adjacent to the first region, and a ... same compensating wiring ... facing the reflective electrode and the transmissive electrode*, as essentially recited in claim 4.

Thus, the combination of Jun and Yamasaki cannot render obvious claim 4. Accordingly, claim 4 is believed to be patentable over Jun and Yamasaki.


Claims 5-10 are believed to be patentable over Jun and Yamasaki at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 4.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully submitted.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Robert J. Newman  
Reg. No. 60,718  
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889